



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,823	08/08/2001	Gregory P. Fitzpatrick	BOC9-2000-0083(218)	2585

7590 01/02/2004

Gregory A. Nelson  
Akerman Senterfitt  
222 Lakeview Avenue, Fourth Floor  
P.O. Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

EHICHIOYA, FRED I

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,823

Applicant(s)

FITZPATRICK ET AL.

Examiner

Fred I. Ehichioya

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 - 19, and 21 - 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 26 are pending in this office action.
2. The examiner accepts the drawings filed on October 23, 2001.
3. Claims 1, 3 – 19, and 21 – 26 are rejected
4. Claims 2 and 20 are objected to.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,978,770 issued to Waytena et al (Hereinafter "Waytena") in view of USPN 5,832,451 issued to Flake et al (hereinafter "Flake").

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Waytena teaches in a relational database management system (RDBMS), a method of processing related records comprising:

receiving a plurality of related records (see Fig.2D and column 10, lines 4 – 20);  
inserting said plurality of related records into a single table of an RDBMS (see column 10, lines 63 – 67 and column 23, lines 40 – 67); and  
responsive to a triggering condition, selectively purging particular related records of said set from said single table (see column 3, lines 23 – 37).

Waytena does not explicitly teach associating said plurality of related records as a set within said single table using a published function of said RDBMS.

Flake teaches associating said plurality of related records as a set within said single table using a published function of said RDBMS (see column 8, lines 33 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Flake with the teaching of Waytena wherein set of tasks or records are group together. The motivation is that associating the records makes it easy for a set of tasks to be easily identified.

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Waytena teaches wherein said purging step purges each one of said plurality of related records (see column 3, lines 23 – 27).

Regarding claims 4 and 22, Waytena teaches wherein said table includes a data type for specifying said plurality of related records and said associating step further comprises assigning to each one of said plurality of related records a common identifier conforming with said data type, wherein said common identifier is unique to said set (see column 10, lines 21 – 30).

Regarding claims 7 and 25, Flake teaches said associating step further comprising:

associating selected records of said set as a subset wherein said particular related records of said purging step include at least one selected record of said subset (see column 8, lines 33 – 67 and column 9, lines 1 – 18).

Regarding claims 8 and 26, Waytena teaches in a relational database management system (RDBMS), a method of processing related records comprising:

receiving a plurality of related records (see Fig.2D and column 10, lines 4 – 20);  
inserting said plurality of related records into a single table of an RDBMS (see column 10, lines 63 – 67 and column 23, lines 40 – 67); and

responsive to a triggering condition identifying at least one of said plurality of related records, selectively purging particular non-identified related records of said set (see column 3, lines 23 – 37).

Waytena does not explicitly teach associating said plurality of related records as a set within said single table, wherein each one of said plurality of related records is assigned a common identifier unique to said set which conforms to a data type in said table for associating said plurality of related records.

Flake teaches associating said plurality of related records as a set within said single table, wherein each one of said plurality of related records is assigned a common identifier unique to said set which conforms to a data type in said table for associating said plurality of related records (see column 8, lines 33 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Flake with the teaching of Waytena wherein set of tasks or records are group together. The motivation is that associating the records makes it easy for a set of tasks to be easily identified.

Regarding claims 9 and 14, Waytena teaches a relational database management system (RDBMS), comprising:

a purge record set processor for purging selected ones of said record set in said table responsive to a triggering condition (see column 3, lines 23 – 37).

Waytena does not explicitly teach a table for storing a plurality of records wherein particular ones of said plurality of records are related; an associate record set processor

for associating said related ones of said plurality of records with one another as a record set within said table; and a second pre-defined table within said RDBMS for maintaining associations of said related ones of said plurality of records within said table as said record set.

Flake teaches a table for storing a plurality of records wherein particular ones of said plurality of records are related (see column 8, lines 49 – 55);

an associate record set processor for associating said related ones of said plurality of records with one another as a record set within said table (see column 8, lines 33 – 67); and

a second pre-defined table within said RDBMS for maintaining associations of said related ones of said plurality of records within said table as said record set (see column 14, line 58 through column 15, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Flake with the teaching of Waytena wherein relational database is a table for storing set of tasks or records. The motivation is that it is easy to search records in a relational database.

Regarding claim 10, Flake teaches a second pre-defined table within said RDBMS for maintaining associations of said related ones of said plurality of records within said table (see column 14, line 58 thru column 15, line 2).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, Flake teaches said identifier is a data type (see column 8, lines 52 – 53).

Regarding claims 13 and 18, Waytena teaches said purge record set function deletes records linked to said purged records throughout said RDBMS (see column 3, lines 23 – 27).

Regarding claim 15, Flake teaches said pre-defined table includes an identifier for specifying related ones of said plurality of records (see column 8, lines 51 – 55).

7. Claims 5, 6, 12, 17, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waytena in view of Flake and further in view of USPN 5,499,359 issued to Narayanan Vijaykumar (hereinafter "Vijaykumar").

Regarding claims 5, 12, 17 and 23, Waytena and Flake disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed in claims 1, 9 14 and 19 respectively.

Waytena or Flake does not explicitly teach disassociating selected records from said set responsive to a triggering condition.

Vijaykumar teaches disassociating selected records from said set responsive to a triggering condition (see column 9, lines 54 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Vijaykumar with the teaching of Waytena



and Flake wherein some record are removed from the queue as a result some type of triggering event. The motivation is that disassociation removes all the child's records associated with parent record when the parent record is deleted.

Regarding claims 6 and 24, Vijaykumar teaches deleting throughout said RDBMS, records linked to said purged records using referential integrity rules (see column 17, lines 55 – 67).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 2 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 2 and 20, the prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest, wherein said triggering condition identifies at least one of said plurality of related records and said purging step purges non-identified related records of said set.


**Conclusion**

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred I. Ehichioya whose telephone number is 703-305-8039. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-303-3900.

Fred I. Ehichioya  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2172  
December 24, 2003

  
SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER